

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 25 2007

10/548,684

REMARKS

The specification is objected to for the reasons noted in the official action, e.g., the alleged deficiency in paragraph 0103 and the inconsistency concerning FIGS. 6 and 7. The Applicant acknowledges and respectfully traverses the raised objections in view of the following remarks.

Contrary to what the Examiner alleges, page 35, paragraph 0103 of the specification states that the "underneath on the side opposite to the player side (left side in Fig. 6) is curved." In other words, the undersurface of the weight lever stabilizing rail 93 is curved upward toward the direction opposite to the player side. As clearly stated, "the side opposite to the player side" is the left side and "toward the direction opposite to the player side" which is toward the left in FIG. 6. It is to be appreciated that the embodiment in FIG. 6 is the same as the embodiment in FIG. 4—regarding the setting direction of the weight lever 21—and thus the player side is toward the right side in FIG. 6. In any event, the specification is slightly revised to clarify the disclosure of the curvature of the weight lever stabilizing rail 93. It is respectfully submitted that the above amended paragraph of the specification overcomes the informalities noted in the specification on file. The undersigned avers that the amended paragraph does not contain any new subject matter.

With respect to FIGS. 6 and 7 not matching paragraph 0103 of the specification, the above clarification and specification amendments are believed to suitably address the raised drawing objection with respect to FIGS. 6 and 7 without requiring any amendment of either drawing.

Claim 20 is then rejected, under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for the reasons noted in the official action. The inadequate written description rejection is acknowledged and respectfully traversed by the above clarification and amendments to paragraph 0103 of the specification.

Next, claims 12, 15, 16 and 18 are rejected for double patenting as being unpatentable over the claims 1-3 of U.S. Patent No. 7,145,062. The Applicant acknowledges and respectfully traverses the raised double patenting rejection in view of the above claim amendments and the following remarks.

5/25/07 - 1:30 PM

- 5 -

10/548,684

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claim 17 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim(s). In accordance with this indication, the subject matter of claims 15-17 is incorporated into independent claim 12 and this amended independent claim is now believed to be allowable. As the remaining claims all depend from amended independent claim 12, those claims are also believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons that amended claim 12 is allowable.

Claims 12 and 13 are then rejected, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by Tamai et al. '875 (U.S. Patent No. 5406875). The Applicant acknowledges and respectfully traverses the raised anticipatory rejection in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

As mentioned above, amended independent claim 12 is now believed to be allowable over the art of record, including Tamai et al. '875. As the claim 13 depends directly from claim 12, claim 13 is also believed to be allowable over the applied art for at least the same reasons and thus further comments concerning the applied art is not provided at this time.

Lastly, claims 14, 20 and 22 are rejected, under 35 U.S.C. § 103, as being unpatentable in view of Tamai et al. '875, while claims 19 and 21 are rejected, under 35 U.S.C. § 103, as being unpatentable over Tamai et al. '875 in view of Levinson '371 (U.S. Pat. No. 4685371). The Applicant acknowledges and respectfully traverses the raised obviousness rejection in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

As claims 14 and 19 both directly depend from amended claim 12, those two dependent claims are also believed to be allowable for at least the same reason that amended claim 12 is now allowable. With respect to claims 20-22, those claims are canceled, without prejudice, from this application.

In view of the above claim amendments, the Applicant respectfully submits that further comments concerning the applied prior art is not believed necessary. The Applicant also notes the remaining prior art cited in the official action. As none of that additional art is applied by the Examiner against the claims of this application, the Applicant is not providing any comments concerning that art as well.

05/25/07 4:55 PM

- 6 -

10/548,684

If any further amendment to this application is believed necessary to advance prosecution and place this case in allowable form, the Examiner is courteously solicited to contact the undersigned representative of the Applicant to discuss the same.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the raised rejection(s) should be withdrawn at this time. If the Examiner disagrees with the Applicant's view concerning the withdrawal of the outstanding rejection(s) or applicability of the Tamai et al. '875 and/or Levinson '371 references, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to indicate the specific passage or passages, or the drawing or drawings, which contain the necessary teaching, suggestion and/or disclosure required by case law. As such teaching, suggestion and/or disclosure is not present in the applied references, the raised rejection should be withdrawn at this time. Alternatively, if the Examiner is relying on his/her expertise in this field, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to enter an affidavit substantiating the Examiner's position so that suitable contradictory evidence can be entered in this case by the Applicant.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the raised rejection(s) should be withdrawn and this application is now placed in a condition for allowance. Action to that end, in the form of an early Notice of Allowance, is courteously solicited by the Applicant at this time.

The Applicant respectfully requests that any outstanding objection(s) or requirement(s), as to the form of this application, be held in abeyance until allowable subject matter is indicated for this case.

In the event that there are any fee deficiencies or additional fees are payable, please charge the same or credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account (Account No. 04-0213).

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Bujold, Reg. No. 32,018
Customer No. 020210
Davis Bujold & Daniels, P.L.L.C.
112 Pleasant Street
Concord, NH 03301-2931
Telephone 603-226-7490
Facsimile 603-226-7499
E-mail: patent@davisandbujold.com

4/25/07 4:38 PM

- 7 -